



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/675,468	09/28/2000	John Bryan Ibbotson	GB919990081US1/1751P	8913
75	590 03/29/2004		EXAMI	NER
Sawyer Law Group LLP			PILLAI, NAMITHA	
P O Box 51418 Palo Alto, CA 94303			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2173	13
			DATE MAILED: 03/29/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Ädvisory Action	09/675,468	IBBOTSON ET AL.			
nancery near.	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Namitha Pillai	2173			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 05 March 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this application appl	cation. A proper reply to a ich places the application in			
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	•			
 a)	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the nailing date o	of the final rejection.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three movement patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the d statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF					
2. \square The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	ecause:				
(a) \square they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note					
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	terially reducing or simplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	I be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendment			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NOT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	:				
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected:					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. \square The drawing correction filed on is a) \square app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	<u> </u>			
10. Other:	(
		IOUN CASTA			
		JOHN CABECA RVISORY PATENT EXAMINED CHNOLOGY CENTER 2422			

CHNULUGY CENTER 2100

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 09/675,468

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Applicant refers to the fact that Mizoguchi is capable of using only simple data types in defining the expressions. The characteristics of the data, wherein specific information concerning data types and their role in the expressions have not been disclosed in the independent claims of the present invention. Furthermore, the term "simple" is ambiguous, wherein a simple data type would contain broad meanings that can be interpreted in various ways. Mizoguchi may be directed to software development for creating a business application program, but it is the process through which, wherein this process includes creating expressions and wherein data structures that represent input and output data structures and data from within these structures are used in creating the expression. These features are both disclosed in Mizoguchi and the present claimed invention as is stated in the rejections.